

Headline: WILL YOU HELP OUR PRESIDENT WIN THE PEACE?

Subhead: His peace plan is working.

Vietnam has been a ten year war; our President has been in office only eighteen months.

Yet -- he is bringing the boys home. He has withdrawn over 115,000 troops. Another 150,000 are scheduled to come home by spring. His goal: no American troops in combat after June, 1971.

Moreover, the President is pursuing a plan for peace -- a plan that means, above all, that thousands of young Americans did not die in vain.

America must seek an honest peace--not just peace at any price.

Subhead: Peace --for Americans--not surrender.

Bold Copy: An amendment before Congress, the McGovern-Hatfield amendment, would force America to abandon Vietnam, at once, regardless of what the enemy does, regardless of the consequences. This is tantamount to surrender, and cripples our chances to win a just peace.

Tell your Senator to vote "No" on this amendment. Write him.

Help defeat the McGovern-Hatfield amendment; dont let it defeat America.

Subhead: Support Americans for Winning the Peace.

We need your help. Winning the peace is everybody's business. Support the President's quest for peace. It is your quest for peace. This is a non-partisan, non-political issue. Your contribution (see coupon below) will help pay for this advertisement and for a continuing public affairs effort by ...

AMERICANS FOR WINNING THE PEACE

(Signatures - local committee)

Coupon: (name of city) Committee of Americans for Winning the Peace
(local address)

I believe in the President's need to win a just and honest peace, and am enclosing \$_____ to help.

Name _____

Street Address _____

City, State and Zip _____

Activity

ic info

Needed

Timing

Responsibility

Comments

a. One or two pg. Fact sheet (highlights of amendment; arguments for; reasons against).

ASAP

Hogue (with liaison with John Smith, Sen. Dole's ofc).

Needed for Senate, House, mass mailings, and "Kit". (Very important.)

b. Brief "sample speech" (3-5 minutes) - for TV, community use, etc.

Wk of 7/27

Magruder

In planning.

c. Detailed analysis of amend-ment: 100 reasons why it is wrong & dangerous.

Wk of 7/27

Colson/Bradley

Need research expert, ana requested by Sen. Dole.

d. Background paper on "Committee for a Livable World".

Wk of 7/27

Colson/Bradley

Same as above.

e. Brochure

f. Statement by President.

Wk of debate Colson

Marsh

1 person in Congress should have responsibility for monitoring this in behalf of concerned.

g. Other papers as requested (legal briefs, questions of legality, etc.)

On request

Marsh

a. Phone calls to 25 cities to establish contact.

ASAP

Bell/Bradley

In progress.

b. Send fact sheet, ad (or ad copy), & instructions, to contacts; request signatures for ad.

7/29

Bradley

c. Send other materials & instructions when proposed

8/5

Bradley

d. Request local sponsorship Senators' flying tour.

As soon as schedule is firm.

Bradley? Magruder? Senate? House?

If this should go, there should be 1 person assigned to live with this project & all calls; we can monitor.

Call me

No Objection To Declassification in Full 2010/08/31 : LOC-HAK-7-4-3-6

ACTION PLAN

No Objection To Declassification in Full 2010/08/31 : LOC-HAK-7-4-3-6

Activity

Needed

Timing

Responsibility

Comments

ison with
11 it to
ol" Commit-

a. Ads approved & placed in 25 key cities.

Wk of 8/10
or 8/17

Magruder

Copy should be completed approved by 7/28, to be mailed 7/29 to regions.

b. Names from cities

(1) "Hanoi" list -----

NOW -----

Magruder

(2) From regions -----

Wk of 8/3

Bradley

Magruder to combine and g to "Hanoi".

c. Mass mailings of "Fact sheet".

Wk of 8/10

Magruder

Mailings by "Hanoi".

d. Have back-up ads ready for Sept. campaign (same cities), if Senate debate

Magruder

By "Hanoi".

• Copy, layout -----

Wk of 8/10

• Insertion -----

1st wk,
Sept.

Support by youth -- ads, etc.

Wk of 8/24

Bradley/Stevens

There is little that can done between now and Sept to get action during the vacation.

-- and mainly for follow-on program as schools open. Liaison with "Youth Conference".

• Kit

Continuing

• Strategy by
Colson

• TV commercials

• Materials by
Magruder

• Statement(s) by President

Press plan

th progra-

No Objection To Declassification in Full 2010/08/31 : LOC-HAK-7-4-3-6

ACTION PLAN

Activity	Needed	Timing	Responsibility	Comments
Community Programs:	<p>a. <u>Short range</u>: In addition to signatures for ads and some support on specific projects (visits by Senators), <u>little action</u> can be completed in 3 wks.</p> <p>b. <u>Continuing</u>:</p> <p>(1) Get "cadres" appointed for 25 cities.</p> <p>(2) Develop sample "charter" and "model" program.</p> <p>(3) Get "cadres" of 25 cities going on their cities (working with local organizations, but supplied with materials & ideas from control source.)</p> <p>(4) Convene "leadership conference" of city representatives to compare plans and charters.</p> <p>(5) Suggest and help organization at least one major event of nat'l significance, such as:</p> <p>• Coordinated community meetings across the country.</p>	Before Sen. vote.	Bradley	But long-range plans must be developed in parallel, so local supporters get involved in the continuing program
	<p>(1) Get "cadres" appointed for 25 cities.</p> <p>(2) Develop sample "charter" and "model" program.</p> <p>(3) Get "cadres" of 25 cities going on their cities (working with local organizations, but supplied with materials & ideas from control source.)</p>	WK of 8/10	Bradley	White has already done this in Indianapolis.
	<p>(3) Get "cadres" of 25 cities going on their cities (working with local organizations, but supplied with materials & ideas from control source.)</p>	Sept.	Peter White (404) 261-5765 Bradley 5538	We will have laid ground in communities by having recruited support at nat level of associations and groups.
	<p>(4) Convene "leadership conference" of city representatives to compare plans and charters.</p>	Oct.	Nat'l Chairman. (see below)	The President can "responsible" by meeting with them.
	<p>(5) Suggest and help organization at least one major event of nat'l significance, such as:</p> <p>• Coordinated community meetings across the country.</p>	November	Nat'l Chairman. (see below)	

(Cont - Next page)

ACTION PLAN

Activity	Needed	Timing	Responsibility	Comments
National <u>Committee</u>	<p>• Joint sponsorship: Jaycees & World Affairs Councils in 35 or more cities -- same day.</p> <p>• Subject: "Priorities for Peace".</p> <p>• President responds to this by appearing to all of them on closed-circuit TV.</p> <p>We need outside identification but linked to White House</p> <p>• Decide approach & title.</p> <p>• Complete plan.</p>	<p>Wk of 7/27</p> <p>Wk of 8/31</p>	Bradley	See attached plan.
				<p><i>Morris</i></p>

McGovern-Hatfield amendment #609 "to end the war"Highlights

Purpose is to force the U. S. to cease all military operations in South Vietnam by December 31, 1970, and end military assistance to Cambodia and Laos unless Congress declares war. It would also require all U. S. military personnel to be out of Vietnam by June 30, 1971.

Arguments for and reasons against1. "The President is expanding the war":

Senator Hatfield has argued that President Nixon's policies, like those of President Johnson, are expanding the war, and that there is but one way to end the war: get out at once. Cambodia is cited to prove his point: an ever-enlarging war with no end in sight.

Fact: The President has a plan to end the war, and it is in operation. Further, it is succeeding. Since his inauguration, he has reduced troop strength in Vietnam from 532,500 to 417,500, with another 150,000 scheduled to come home by spring with all combat troops out by next year. As for American troops in Cambodia, they were withdrawn on schedule, documenting the President's point.

2. "Withdrawal will save lives":

The argument is that "the way to protect our men is to bring them home and bring them home now." This argument assumes that surrender is safe, and that the victorious aggressor will never aggress again. It assumes that the enemy will take no reprisals against our allies left behind.

Fact: Instant withdrawal will bring a bloodbath. The Communists slaughtered thousands upon thousands of North Vietnamese when they came to power in 1954. Is there reason to believe that they would be more gentle with the hundreds of thousands who fled from North to South? --or with the South Vietnamese who have resisted the aggressor? As for American lives, casualties are down 60% since 1968.

3. "U. S. national security is not at stake":

Proponents of the surrender amendment state that "our democracy is now more in danger from within than from without"... that "historically nations disintegrate from within and because of involvement in foreign wars". This would be true if all nations were willing to keep the peace.

Fact: Regrettably, the world is not at peace, and America cannot get out of the world. The "Nixon doctrine" is less involvement: to help allies to defend themselves but not to fight their wars for them. But total withdrawal would be disastrous. It would leave a power vacuum. It would invite aggression on other fronts, as in World War I, II, and Korea. Let's remember: one-third of mankind now lives under Communist dictatorships, and not one of those dictatorships was "elected" into office.

The argument states, "Our cities are deteriorating. We cannot provide funds for decent medical and social security for our citizens, nor provide for the nutritional needs for our poor."

Fact: This argument completely misses the point. The point is that we simply must bring our nation together, help the poor to rise from their poverty and help themselves to a meaningful life in the freest nation on earth. In terms of budget emphasis, there has already been a shift in national priorities from war to peace. During the Kennedy administration, 48% of the budget was for defense, 29% for non-defense programs. By 1968, it was 44% for defense, 34% for non-defense. Now, for the Fiscal '71 budget the balance has shifted: 41% for non-defense, 37% for defense purposes. But in parallel with this new emphasis on domestic priorities, it is crucial that we provide for the security of our nation in a desperately troubled world. War will never leave us alone through wishful hoping, and peace will never come through appeasement. Indeed, appeasement is the shortest route to World War III.

5. "Withdrawal would help the Paris peace negotiations":

Senator Hatfield has predicted that U. S. unilateral withdrawal, posthaste, would break the stalemate in Paris and "enliven the negotiations".

Fact: This prediction is no doubt accurate. The surrender amendment should enliven the negotiations in Paris just as Munich enlivened Hitler. The "enlivenment"--regrettably--would probably not be in terms of any action or concessions by the Communists at the peace table.

6. "Only a timetable can extricate the President":

Proponents of the amendment state, "It is our sincere conviction that this is the only strategy open to the President for insuring our disengagement from the war." The assumption is that the enemy is calling all the shots--literally and figuratively--and that the American president has only two alternatives: either to quit and run, or to stay and fight.

Fact: The President is calling the shots, and the withdrawals. Simply stated, the war is being turned over to the Asians. And the Asians are developing the capacity to defend themselves. Throughout the entire arc of free Asia--from Japan through South Korea to Taiwan and the Philippines, to Indonesia, Malasia and Thailand--and now including South Vietnam--there is steady growth, greater strength and self-reliance. The Cambodian war proved the increasing strength and reliability of South Vietnamese forces. In truth, a major national priority must be to look beyond the fighting to the task of nation-building, a process which is now historical fact for much of that part of the world.

7. "America has no business propping up corrupt governments":

The accusation is made repeatedly that the South Vietnamese Government "is not democratic", that it is "no better than the Communists", and that America has no business "doing business with dictatorships". Greece, Brazil, and other nations are put in this category "which we should leave alone". The point is made that the U. S. should mind its own business.

Fact: National security is America's business. Let's get our priorities straight. We are not out to prop up governments, or remake other nations into our image and likeness. But for our sakes, we have a responsibility to help hold crime in check on the world scene. World violence threatens us. Our first priority is American security. Since World War II, every American President--Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon--has held steadfast to a single conviction: that a U.S. retreat to isolation in the nuclear age would be fatal. Nixon policies are directed toward one objective: peace ... a better peace, peace with honor. In truth, this is what all Americans want, and President Nixon is convinced that such a peace can be won.

I. WHAT IS THE "AMENDMENT TO END THE WAR"?

The so called "Amendment to End the War" would require that the United States, by December 31, 1970, cease all military operations in South Vietnam and terminate all military assistance to Cambodia and Laos unless the Congress declares war. It also provides that all American military personnel must be out of Vietnam by June 30, 1971.

It would terminate the war in Indochina by unilateral American withdrawal, accomplishing through Congressional action what the Communists have been unable to accomplish on the battlefield.

II. WHO ARE THE SPONSORS OF THE "AMENDMENT TO END THE WAR"?

Introduced by Senators Hatfield, McGovern, Hughes, Goodell and Cranston, the measure (popularly known as the McGovern-Hatfield Amendment) is sponsored by an elaborate, well-financed, peace-at-any-price lobby, actively engaged in promoting the measure as a "responsible" method of terminating the war in Vietnam. Currently, supporters of the measure claim up to 40 votes in the United States Senate.

The principal lobby behind the measure is the Amendment to End the War Committee, consisting of 24 members of the Senate and established to exert public pressure on their colleagues. For the first time in American history members of the Senate have organized as a lobby to solicit funds for a national advertising campaign designed to see an instant solution to a complex national security issue--much as one sells soap or toothpaste.

The committee has raised over one-half million dollars to finance an advertising campaign which makes use of Madison-Avenue-designed television commercials. Rather than a committee of statesmen, this lobby is a committee of salesmen. Statecraft has yielded to hucksterism.

Senators sponsoring the misnamed "Amendment to End the War" have assigned members of their Senatorial staffs to work for the lobbying committee while receiving their full salaries as public employees, and they have approved the use of their names in paid newspaper ads throughout the country soliciting funds to finance the committee's propaganda activities. Such were the Senators of Rome when Rome fell.

The youth division of this lobby is known as "Project Pursestrings," a coalition of experienced, "antiwar" activists, many of whom were formerly associated with the "Vietnam Moratorium Committee" which sponsored last fall's protest demonstrations in major American cities. It is an old crowd under a new name.

-2-

Another sponsor is the Council for a Livable World, an old-line, unilateral disarmament organization which has consistently opposed the defense preparedness programs of three national administrations. The CLW is an experienced solicitor of funds for members of Congress who share its extremist views on national security policy, and Senator George McGovern, a principal architect of the surrender amendment, has been a prominent beneficiary of the financial largess of this organization--over \$20,000 in one campaign alone.

III. WHAT ARE THE OBJECTIONS TO THE "AMENDMENT TO END THE WAR"?

1. It is a blueprint for surrender. The consequences of this amendment, if not its purpose, are obvious and simple: surrender South Vietnam and its 12 million people to the Communists--give up and announce our defeat. Should this amendment be adopted, millions of Americans will have fought, 280,000 Americans will have been wounded and 43,000 will have died--for nothing. This amendment is a proposal to snatch military defeat from the jaws of victory. After five years of arduous struggle at great cost to the United States and at the moment when the tide has turned and time is on our side, the proponents of this proposal would have us pack up and leave: "Damn the consequences, full speed for home!" The war would end all right--but in an American surrender. This amendment is an invitation to defeat, not merely for the United States, nor merely for South Vietnam, but for the entire Free World.

2. It would end all hope for an honorable and peaceful solution to the war. For years the United States has offered to negotiate seriously and forthrightly in Paris a peaceful settlement to the war. We have now designated a new ambassador to these talks, a man of great eminence and experience. The President has expressed his willingness to consider any serious proposal which Hanoi puts on the table. If this amendment were adopted, Ambassador Bruce might as well not bother to unpack in Paris, because all hope for a negotiated peace would be instantly dashed. There would be absolutely no incentive for the North Vietnamese to negotiate; they would merely sit at the conference table in Paris while their colleagues in Hanoi planned the major military offensive necessary to overrun South Vietnam hours after the last American soldier boarded the plane for home. This amendment is not a formula for peace; it is a prescription for a military and political disaster that 43,000 American men have died to prevent.

3. It would undermine the credibility of American foreign policy worldwide. If the Senate can renege on a commitment to South Vietnam when the going gets tough, what inference will be drawn by those nations that presently rely upon the United States for their freedom? What value, for instance, will a U.S. commitment to Israel to defend her right to national survival have to the leaders in Tel Aviv if the Senate abrogates a commitment to South Vietnam made and supported

by four American Presidents? A nation that violates its pledge is no more trustworthy than an individual who breaks his word, and the lesson will not be lost on our allies throughout the world. In a single act of political expediency, the credibility of the United States would be destroyed. A nation cannot be selective about honoring its commitments; surrender in Southeast Asia is not likely to bolster confidence in our determination to stand firm in the Mideast or Europe or Latin America.

4. It is an act of political irresponsibility designed to undermine the Constitutional authority and world leadership of the President. The President is elected to represent all the people in their dealings with foreign nations, and he is charged under the Constitution with responsibility for protecting the national interests of the United States abroad. It is absurd to think that a handful of Senators are more qualified than the President to determine what is in the best interests of the United States abroad. It is the President, and the President alone, who is authorized to conduct the foreign policy of the United States. It is with the President, and the President alone, that foreign governments must deal in their relations with the United States. Any measure which undermines the authority of the President undermines the power of the United States--undermines its strength, influence and potential for achieving world peace. The President not only has the duty to conduct the foreign policy of the United States, he has the responsibility. He is accountable for his actions; if he is wrong, the people can and should hold him to account. But the band of carping critics in the Senate which would like to assume the power to conduct the foreign policy of the United States has no corresponding burden of responsibility. If they are wrong, to whom are they responsible? To whom will they be held accountable? They represent no one but themselves and the lobby which they have created.

5. It is a political gimmick to steal the "peace issue" from the President since his peace plan is working. President Nixon has promised to end the war--not through surrender, but by phased withdrawal linked to serious negotiations; not at any price, but in such a way as to secure a just and lasting peace in the Pacific. The President's plan is working, but those who have a political stake in its failure, who have been predicting defeat for so long that they have acquired a vested interest in defeat, fear the President's success so much they would prefer America's surrender and defeat. They interpret the desire of the American people for peace as a wish for peace at any price, and in their crass desire to capitalize on the politics of the war/peace issue, they are willing to pay any price necessary to profit from the political dividends which may be generated by exploitation of the Vietnam peace issue. For such men, politics doesn't stop at the water's edge; they would swim the Mekong if the price was right.

6. This kind of divisive debate only can prolong the war. So long as the North Vietnamese believe that they may win on the floor of the U. S. Congress a war they can't win on the battlefield of South Vietnam, they have no incentive to

negotiate or cease their aggression. To the contrary, they are encouraged by the internal division fomented by the high powered surrender lobby.

IV. WHAT IS THE ALTERNATIVE TO THE "AMENDMENT TO END THE WAR"?

The Washington Post has called the amendment "reckless" and this is the kindest word that can be used to describe it. It is not a serious solution to the Vietnam war; if it were, it would be advocated with that seriousness which characterizes thoughtful proposals, not merchandized with cute television commercials and tasteless newspaper ads.

President Nixon has proposed a program for peace which is serious and responsible. More importantly, it is working. When he took office there were 532,500 American troops in South Vietnam. He has already brought home more than 115,000. Another 50,000 will be home by October, with an additional 100,000 returning by early spring of 1971.

To protect the remaining U.S. forces, the President ordered a swift and decisive attack upon the Communist sanctuaries along the Cambodian-South Vietnamese border. This operation was a major military success, severely crippling the ability of North Vietnamese forces to strike across the border at the residual American forces. He promised that this operation would be limited in time, in territory and in purpose, and he kept his promise. We have not been drawn into a new or expanded war in Cambodia; but we were able to increase the prospects for a shortened war in Vietnam. Greatly reduced American casualties since the end of the Cambodian operation prove that the President was right.

The keystone of the President's plan to extricate the United States from the war is the Vietnamization program. Under this program, a strengthened South Vietnamese army can replace American troops, permitting phased withdrawals of our forces without jeopardizing the objectives which led to our initial involvement.

It is frequently overlooked, for example, that 60 per cent of the troops involved in the attacks upon the Cambodian sanctuaries were South Vietnamese. Two years ago this would have been impossible. South Vietnamese forces are increasingly able to fight the war on their own, with only American logistical and air support. This has not happened by accident, but as the result of carefully conceived and executed plan designed to shift the combat burden to those who have the greatest stake in the outcome.

The Vietnamization program goes well beyond the important tasks of military training and technical assistance. The full program is also political and economic. It is significant that--in the midst of war--the South Vietnamese also have written a constitution, held national elections, developed a national assembly and an independent judiciary, undertaken major land reform and anti-corruption programs and placed great stress on the rebirth of the cherished Vietnamese tradition of local self-government.

-5-

The proof of the success of the Vietnamization program is obvious in two facts: the rate of American withdrawal and the number of American combat casualties. At the end of President Nixon's second year in office, more than 165,000 American troops will have been withdrawn from Vietnam. In 1968, we lost an average of 280 men per week; in 1970 that figure has been reduced to less than 100 per week. Correspondingly, South Vietnamese casualty figures have increased as ARVN forces have assumed a greater share of the combat responsibility.

Since the Cambodian operation, the world has noted the new confidence and strength of the South Vietnamese government and its army. Veteran military observers who have been traditionally skeptical of the capabilities of the South Vietnamese armed forces have commented favorably on their outstanding performance. No one is more familiar with the aggressiveness and proficiency of the ARVN forces than the North Vietnamese who face them in combat.

Time is now the enemy of the Communists and the ally of Saigon and Washington.

An end to the war in Vietnam cannot be legislated in Washington; it is going to be won on the battlefields of South Vietnam and at the peace table in Paris. In the meantime, Americans are coming home, and more will come in the future.

Political opportunism is no substitute for patient courage, and a legislated surrender no substitute for an honorable and just peace.

Prepared by: The Tell It To Hanoi Committee
Post Office Box 965
Radio City Station
New York, New York 10019